



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,867	12/09/2003	Carl D. Wahlstrand	1023-336USD1	6722
28863 7590 02/11/2009 SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P. A. 1625 RADIO DRIVE SUITE 300 WOODBURY, MN 55125				
EXAMINER REIDEL, JESSICA L				
ART UNIT 3766		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/11/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pairedocketing@ssiplaw.com

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/731,867	WAHLSTRAND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JESSICA REIDEL	3766	

  

All Participants:

(1) JESSICA REIDEL.

(2) Jason D. Kelly.

Date of Interview: 5 February 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

  

Claims discussed:

1, 30, and 35

  

Prior art documents discussed:

Faltys et al. (U.S. 6,308,101) (herein Faltys)

Part II.

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

/Jessica L. Reidel/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3766

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Time: 10:00 AM

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: To avoid the Faltys reference, the Examiner suggested that Applicant amend Claims 1, 30, and 35 to more closely define the embodiment of the IMD depicted in Fig. 10B of the originally-filed disclosure of the instant application. For example, the Examiner suggested that Applicant change each of Claims 1, 30, and 35 to firstly define that the plurality of interconnected modules are horizontally distributed in a manner such that a space is defined between each of the interconnected modules and to define the flexible overmold as being one that at least partially encapsulates each of the interconnected modules "wherein the flexible overmold exists within and fills said space". Applicant agreed to attempt to amend Claims 1, 30, and 35 along the lines of the Examiner's suggestions. A draft supplemental response should be faxed to the Examiner by Monday February 9, 2009. Upon Examiner approval, a formal supplemental response should be filed by Friday February 13, 2009.